

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action of October 4, 2007 in connection with the above-identified patent application. Reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 3

Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This has been done by amending claim 3 to incorporate the features of claim 1 from which claim 3 formerly depended. Claim 3 is therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-28

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 13, 16, 18, 21-23, and 24-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Slick in view of Boneh. Claims 10, 11, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Slick in view of Boneh in view of Van Oorschot. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Slick in view of Boneh in view of Lord. The features of claim 12 were not specifically addressed. These rejections are respectfully

traversed.

In their Reply of July 6, 2007, applicants explained in detail why independent claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims are allowable.

In particular, applicants explained how the Slick patent describes two embodiments of a system in which documents can be sent securely to a printer, neither of which shows or suggests the features of claims 1 and 21. Applicants also explained how the Boneh reference fails to make up for the deficiencies of Slick.

In the first embodiment of Slick, which is shown in FIG. 5A of Slick, data is encrypted by symmetric key 510. The symmetric key is encrypted using a printer public key 520 to produce a printer-key-encrypted symmetric key 511. The printer-key-encrypted symmetric key 511 is encrypted with a recipient public key 530 to produce twice-encrypted symmetric key 512.

In the second embodiment of Slick, which is shown in FIG. 5B of Slick, the printer public key 520 is used to encrypt data 581 directly, forming printer-public-key-encrypted data 582. As shown on the right-hand side of FIG. 5B, encrypted data 582 is then encrypted using recipient public key 530 to produce twice-encrypted data 582.

In their July 6, 2007 Reply, applicants distinguished claims 1 and 21 from the cited prior art. In particular,

applicants explained how Slick does not use an outer layer of message encryption having an associated outer-layer public key to encrypt an inner-layer public key.

The Patent Office addressed this argument on page 2 of the October 4, 2007 Office Action under the heading "Response to Arguments."

In the first paragraph of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, it was stated that the Examiner disagrees with applicants' assertions regarding Slick. Specifically, it was stated that "Slick fails to teach use of an outer layer of message encryption having an associated outer-layer public key to encrypt an inner-layer public key" (Office Action, page 2). In support of this position, the Patent Office states that column 10, lines 12-45 of Slick (i.e., Slick's first embodiment) discloses "an outer-layer of message encryption having an associated outer-layer user public key used to encrypt an inner-layer printer public key". This is simply not true. The user public key in Slick is not used to encrypt the printer public key as asserted by the Examiner. Rather, as explained previously by applicants, the user public key in Slick is used to encrypt the printer-key-encrypted symmetric key of Slick thereby producing twice-encrypted symmetric key 512. Because the Examiner's attempted rebuttal argument is based on an incorrect characterization of Slick, claims 1 and 21 are

allowable as originally set forth in applicants' July 6, 2007 Reply.

In the second paragraph of the Response to Arguments section of the October 4, 2007 Office Action, additional statements were presented by the Patent Office in an attempt to rebut applicants' arguments. In particular, it was asserted that applicant had previously argued that "Slick fails to disclose an inner layer of message encryption that has an associated inner-layer public key or use of an outer layer private key or an inner layer private key." (Office Action, page 2). This is a misquotation of applicants' argument. What applicants actually stated was that Slick "fails to show or suggest an inner layer of message encryption that has an associated inner-layer IBE public key, an outer layer of message encryption that has an associated outer-layer IBE public key, or use of an outer layer IBE private key or inner-layer IBE private key." (Applicants' July 6, 2007 Reply, page 23). Applicants' original statements are true and are further reasons why claims 1 and 21 are patentable.

In any event, applicants continue to stand by their original position that claims 1 and 21 are patentable because Slick does not use an outer layer of message encryption having an associated outer-layer public key to encrypt an inner-layer public key as required by claims 1 and 21. The Patent Office's

attempted rebuttal of this point relying on Slick is deficient, because Slick discloses use of a user public key to encrypt a printer-key-encrypted symmetric key, not use of an outer layer of message encryption having an associated outer-layer public key to encrypt an inner-layer public key. Claims 2 and 4-20 depend from claim 1 and are patentable because claim 1 is patentable. Claims 22-28 depend from claim 21 and are patentable because claim 21 is patentable.

The foregoing shows that claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiencies or to credit any overpayments in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 502942.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/2/2008

/G. Victor Treyz/
G. Victor Treyz
Reg. No. 36,294
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 36532